

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 Timothy Cleveland,

7 Plaintiffs,

8 v.

9 Andrew Flores, et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-00511-CDS-DJA

Order

11 Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion "concerning summons." (ECF No. 19). In it,
12 Plaintiff alleges that the law firm of Leach Kern Gruchow Song is "obstruct[ing] this court
13 process," by not accepting service on behalf of Defendants Andrew Flores and Larry Palmer.
14 (*Id.*). Plaintiff asks for the Court to "verify" that Flores and Palmer "received summons,"
15 "determine the extent of Leach[] Kern Gruchow and Song attorney services to the First Light at
16 Old Vegas Ranch 237 Homeowners," and provide Palmer a second opportunity to file a response.
17 (*Id.* at 4). Plaintiff attaches letters from Leach Kern Gruchow Song in which the firm states that it
18 "serves as the legal counsel for the First Light at Old Vegas Ranch Homeowners Association (the
19 'Association')." (*Id.* at 8). The firm further explains:

20 While this office serves as legal counsel for the Association, our
21 firm is not the Registered Agent for the Association and we are not
22 authorized to accept service of process on behalf of the Association.
23 However, the Association is not a named defendant in the lawsuit.
24 Our firm is not legal counsel for the named defendants Andrew
25 Flores or Larry Palmer. As such we are not authorized to accept
26 service of process on their behalf.

27 (*Id.*).

28 The firm has filed an affidavit disputing Plaintiff's "proof of service" as to Palmer filed at
ECF No. 17. (ECF No. 18). The firm also responded to Plaintiff's motion. (ECF No. 20). In
both filings, the firm explains that it is not counsel for Palmer and Flores, cannot accept service

1 for them, and that the firm and the First Light at Old Vegas Ranch Homeowners Association are
2 not parties to this action.

3 Given the firm's explanations and the fact that Plaintiff has provided no basis for the relief
4 he seeks, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion. The Court further directs Plaintiff to review and
5 follow Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4 regarding service of summons.

6
7 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 19) is **denied**.

8
9 DATED: September 6, 2024

10
11 

12 _____
13 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28